State Bar Court of California Hearing Department San Francisco ACTUAL SUSPENSION		
Counsel For The State Bar Catherine E. Taylor Deputy Trial Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 415-538-2537	Case Number(s): 13-O-12074	For Court use only PUBLIC MATTER FILED OCT 1 7 2013
Bar # 210540 Counsel For Respondent		STATE BAR COURT CLERK'S OFFICE SAN FRANCISCO
Geoffrey A. Mires Rankin, Sproat, Mires, Beaty & Reynolds 1970 Broadway, Suite 1150 Oakland, CA 94612 510-465-3922	Submitted to: Settlement Ju STIPULATION RE FACTS, C DISPOSITION AND ORDER	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND
Bar # 98428 In the Matter of: TERRI LEIGH BREWER	ACTUAL SUSPENSION	ON REJECTED
Bar # 212743 A Member of the State Bar of California (Respondent)		

Note: All information required by this form and any additional information which cannot be provided in the space provided, must be set forth in an attachment to this stipulation under specific headings, e.g., "Facts," "Dismissals," "Conclusions of Law," "Supporting Authority," etc.

A. Parties' Acknowledgments:

- (1) Respondent is a member of the State Bar of California, admitted April 23, 2001.
- (2) The parties agree to be bound by the factual stipulations contained herein even if conclusions of law or disposition are rejected or changed by the Supreme Court.
- (3) All investigations or proceedings listed by case number in the caption of this stipulation are entirely resolved by this stipulation and are deemed consolidated. Dismissed charge(s)/count(s) are listed under "Dismissals." The stipulation consists of 13 pages, not including the order.

1

(Effective January 1, 2011)



Actual Suspension

- (4) A statement of acts or omissions acknowledged by Respondent as cause or causes for discipline is included under "Facts."
- (5) Conclusions of law, drawn from and specifically referring to the facts are also included under "Conclusions of Law".
- (6) The parties must include supporting authority for the recommended level of discipline under the heading "Supporting Authority."
- (7) No more than 30 days prior to the filing of this stipulation, Respondent has been advised in writing of any pending investigation/proceeding not resolved by this stipulation, except for criminal investigations.
- (8) Payment of Disciplinary Costs—Respondent acknowledges the provisions of Bus. & Prof. Code §§6086.10 & 6140.7. (Check one option only):
 - Until costs are paid in full, Respondent will remain actually suspended from the practice of law unless relief is obtained per rule 5.130, Rules of Procedure.
 - Costs are to be paid in equal amounts prior to February 1 for the following membership years: (Hardship, special circumstances or other good cause per rule 5.132, Rules of Procedure.) If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.

Costs are waived in part as set forth in a separate attachment entitled "Partial Waiver of Costs".

Costs are entirely walved.

B. Aggravating Circumstances [for definition, see Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, standard 1.2(b)]. Facts supporting aggravating circumstances are required.

- (1) Prior record of discipline [see standard 1.2(f)]
 - (a) State Bar Court case # of prior case
 - (b) Date prior discipline effective
 - (c) Rules of Professional Conduct/ State Bar Act violations:
 - (d) Degree of prior discipline
 - (e) If Respondent has two or more incidents of prior discipline, use space provided below.
- (2) Dishonesty: Respondent's misconduct was surrounded by or followed by bad faith, dishonesty, concealment, overreaching or other violations of the State Bar Act or Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) Trust Violation: Trust funds or property were involved and Respondent refused or was unable to account to the client or person who was the object of the misconduct for improper conduct toward said funds or property.
- (4) X Harm: Respondent's misconduct harmed significantly a client, the public or the administration of justice. See Attachment to Stipulation page 10.

Actual Suspension

- (5) Indifference: Respondent demonstrated indifference toward rectification of or atonement for the consequences of his or her misconduct.
- (6) Lack of Cooperation: Respondent displayed a lack of candor and cooperation to victims of his/her misconduct or to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation or proceedings.
- (7) Multiple/Pattern of Misconduct: Respondent's current misconduct evidences multiple acts of wrongdoing or demonstrates a pattern of misconduct. See Attachment to Stipulation page 10.
- (8) **No aggravating circumstances** are involved.

Additional aggravating circumstances:

C. Mitigating Circumstances [see standard 1.2(e)]. Facts supporting mitigating circumstances are required.

- (1) No Prior Discipline: Respondent has no prior record of discipline over many years of practice coupled with present misconduct which is not deemed serious.
- (2) **No Harm:** Respondent did not harm the client or person who was the object of the misconduct.
- (3) Candor/Cooperation: Respondent displayed spontaneous candor and cooperation with the victims of his/her misconduct and to the State Bar during disciplinary investigation and proceedings.
- (4) Remorse: Respondent promptly took objective steps spontaneously demonstrating remorse and recognition of the wrongdoing, which steps were designed to timely atone for any consequences of his/her misconduct.
- (5) Restitution: Respondent paid \$ on in restitution to without the threat or force of disciplinary, civil or criminal proceedings.
- (6) Delay: These disciplinary proceedings were excessively delayed. The delay is not attributable to Respondent and the delay prejudiced him/her.
- (7) Good Faith: Respondent acted in good faith.
- (8) Emotional/Physical Difficulties: At the time of the stipulated act or acts of professional misconduct Respondent suffered extreme emotional difficulties or physical disabilities which expert testimony would establish was directly responsible for the misconduct. The difficulties or disabilities were not the product of any Illegal conduct by the member, such as illegal drug or substance abuse, and Respondent no longer suffers from such difficulties or disabilities.
- (9) Severe Financial Stress: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered from severe financial stress which resulted from circumstances not reasonably foreseeable or which were beyond his/her control and which were directly responsible for the misconduct.
- (10) Family Problems: At the time of the misconduct, Respondent suffered extreme difficulties in his/her personal life which were other than emotional or physical in nature.
- (11) Good Character: Respondent's good character is attested to by a wide range of references in the legal and general communities who are aware of the full extent of his/her misconduct.

- (12) Rehabilitation: Considerable time has passed since the acts of professional misconduct occurred followed by convincing proof of subsequent rehabilitation.
- (13) **No mitigating circumstances** are involved.

Additional mitigating circumstances:

No Prior Discipline-- See Additional Facts re: Mitigating Circumstances at page 10. Pretrial Stipulation-- See Additional Facts re: Mitigating Circumstances at page 10. Good Character-- See Additional Facts re: Mitigating Circumstances at page 10.

D. Discipline:

- (1) X Stayed Suspension:
 - (a) Respondent must be suspended from the practice of law for a period of two years.
 - i. And until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.
 - ii. and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
 - iii. and until Respondent does the following:
 - (b) The above-referenced suspension is stayed.
- (2) \boxtimes **Probation:**

Respondent must be placed on probation for a period of two years, which will commence upon the effective date of the Supreme Court order in this matter. (See rule 9.18, California Rules of Court)

- (3) 🛛 Actual Suspension:
 - (a) Respondent must be actually suspended from the practice of law in the State of California for a period of one year.
 - i. and until Respondent shows proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of rehabilitation and present fitness to practice and present learning and ability in the law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct
 - ii. and until Respondent pays restitution as set forth in the Financial Conditions form attached to this stipulation.
 - iii. and until Respondent does the following:

E. Additional Conditions of Probation:

(1) If Respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he/she must remain actually suspended until he/she proves to the State Bar Court his/her rehabilitation, fitness to practice, and learning and ability in the general law, pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct.

- (2) During the probation period, Respondent must comply with the provisions of the State Bar Act and Rules of Professional Conduct.
- (3) Within ten (10) days of any change, Respondent must report to the Membership Records Office of the State Bar and to the Office of Probation of the State Bar of California ("Office of Probation"), all changes of information, including current office address and telephone number, or other address for State Bar purposes, as prescribed by section 6002.1 of the Business and Professions Code.
- (4) Within thirty (30) days from the effective date of discipline, Respondent must contact the Office of Probation and schedule a meeting with Respondent's assigned probation deputy to discuss these terms and conditions of probation. Upon the direction of the Office of Probation, Respondent must meet with the probation deputy either in-person or by telephone. During the period of probation, Respondent must promptly meet with the probation deputy as directed and upon request.
- (5) Respondent must submit written quarterly reports to the Office of Probation on each January 10, April 10, July 10, and October 10 of the period of probation. Under penalty of perjury, Respondent must state whether Respondent has complied with the State Bar Act, the Rules of Professional Conduct, and all conditions of probation during the preceding calendar quarter. Respondent must also state whether there are any proceedings pending against him or her in the State Bar Court and if so, the case number and current status of that proceeding. If the first report would cover less than 30 days, that report must be submitted on the next quarter date, and cover the extended period.

In addition to all quarterly reports, a final report, containing the same information, is due no earlier than twenty (20) days before the last day of the period of probation and no later than the last day of probation.

- (6) Respondent must be assigned a probation monitor. Respondent must promptly review the terms and conditions of probation with the probation monitor to establish a manner and schedule of compliance. During the period of probation, Respondent must furnish to the monitor such reports as may be requested, in addition to the quarterly reports required to be submitted to the Office of Probation. Respondent must cooperate fully with the probation monitor.
- (7) Subject to assertion of applicable privileges, Respondent must answer fully, promptly and truthfully any inquiries of the Office of Probation and any probation monitor assigned under these conditions which are directed to Respondent personally or in writing relating to whether Respondent is complying or has complied with the probation conditions.
- (8) Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must provide to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.
 - No Ethics School recommended. Reason:
- (9) Respondent must comply with all conditions of probation imposed in the underlying criminal matter and must so declare under penalty of perjury in conjunction with any quarterly report to be filed with the Office of Probation.
- (10) The following conditions are attached hereto and incorporated:
 - Substance Abuse Conditions Law Office Management Conditions
 - Medical Conditions Science Financial Conditions
- F. Other Conditions Negotiated by the Parties:

(1) X Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination: Respondent must provide proof of passage of the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination ("MPRE"), administered by the National Conference of Bar Examiners, to the Office of Probation during the period of actual suspension or within one year, whichever period is longer. Failure to pass the MPRE results in actual suspension without further hearing until passage. But see rule 9.10(b), California Rules of Court, and rule 5.162(A) & (E), Rules of Procedure.

No MPRE recommended. Reason:

- (2) Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court: Respondent must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (3) Conditional Rule 9.20, California Rules of Court: If Respondent remains actually suspended for 90 days or more, he/she must comply with the requirements of rule 9.20, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 120 and 130 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of the Supreme Court's Order in this matter.
- (4) Credit for Interim Suspension [conviction referral cases only]: Respondent will be credited for the period of his/her interim suspension toward the stipulated period of actual suspension. Date of commencement of interim suspension:
- (5) **Other Conditions**:

In the Matter of: TERRI LEIGH BREWER Case Number(s): 13-O-12074

Financial Conditions

a. Restitution

Respondent must pay restitution (including the principal amount, plus interest of 10% per annum) to the payee(s) listed below. If the Client Security Fund ("CSF") has reimbursed one or more of the payee(s) for all or any portion of the principal amount(s) listed below, Respondent must also pay restitution to CSF in the amount(s) paid, plus applicable interest and costs.

Payee	Principal Amount	Interest Accrues From

Respondent must pay above-referenced restitution and provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation not later than

b. Installment Restitution Payments

Respondent must pay the above-referenced restitution on the payment schedule set forth below. Respondent must provide satisfactory proof of payment to the Office of Probation with each quarterly probation report, or as otherwise directed by the Office of Probation. No later than 30 days prior to the expiration of the period of probation (or period of reproval), Respondent must make any necessary final payment(s) in order to complete the payment of restitution, including interest, in full.

Payee/CSF (as applicable)	Minimum Payment Amount	Payment Frequency
		·

If Respondent fails to pay any installment as described above, or as may be modified by the State Bar Court, the remaining balance is due and payable immediately.

c. Client Funds Certificate

- 1. If Respondent possesses client funds at any time during the period covered by a required quarterly report, Respondent must file with each required report a certificate from Respondent and/or a certified public accountant or other financial professional approved by the Office of Probation, certifying that:
 - Respondent has maintained a bank account in a bank authorized to do business in the State of California, at a branch located within the State of California, and that such account is designated as a "Trust Account" or "Clients' Funds Account";

- b. Respondent has kept and maintained the following:
 - i. A written ledger for each client on whose behalf funds are held that sets forth:
 - 1. the name of such client;
 - 2. the date, amount and source of all funds received on behalf of such client;
 - 3. the date, amount, payee and purpose of each disbursement made on behalf of such client; and,
 - 4. the current balance for such client.
 - ii. a written journal for each client trust fund account that sets forth:
 - 1. the name of such account;
 - 2. the date, amount and client affected by each debit and credit; and,
 - 3. the current balance in such account.
 - iii. all bank statements and cancelled checks for each client trust account; and,
 - iv. each monthly reconciliation (balancing) of (i), (ii), and (iii), above, and if there are any differences between the monthly total balances reflected in (i), (ii), and (iii), above, the reasons for the differences.
- c. Respondent has maintained a written journal of securities or other properties held for clients that specifies:
 - i. each item of security and property held;
 - ii. the person on whose behalf the security or property is held;
 - iii. the date of receipt of the security or property;
 - iv. the date of distribution of the security or property; and,
 - v. the person to whom the security or property was distributed.
- If Respondent does not possess any client funds, property or securities during the entire period covered by a report, Respondent must so state under penalty of perjury in the report filed with the Office of Probation for that reporting period. In this circumstance, Respondent need not file the accountant's certificate described above.
- 3. The requirements of this condition are in addition to those set forth in rule 4-100, Rules of Professional Conduct.

d. Client Trust Accounting School

Within one (1) year of the effective date of the discipline herein, Respondent must supply to the Office of Probation satisfactory proof of attendance at a session of the Ethics School Client Trust Accounting School, within the same period of time, and passage of the test given at the end of that session.

Page 8

ATTACHMENT TO

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION

IN THE MATTER OF: TERRI LEIGH BREWER

CASE NUMBER: 13-O-12074

FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW.

Respondent admits that the following facts are true and that she is culpable of violations of the specified statutes and/or Rules of Professional Conduct.

Case No. 13-O-12074 (Complainants: Jennifer and Craig DeVinney)

FACTS:

1. On September 7, 2012, Craig and Jennifer DeVinney ("the DeVinneys") employed Respondent to evict two tenants from a home they owned.

2. On September 14, 2012, one of the DeVinneys' tenants, "Nicole", gave Respondent a cashier's check in the amount of \$1,800 in payment of back rent owed to the DeVinneys. Thereafter, Respondent notified the DeVinneys that she received the check and that she intended to pay herself fees from the \$1,800.

3. On October 16, 2012, Respondent deposited the cashier's check into her client trust account.

4. On October 19, 2012, the DeVinneys sent Respondent an email requesting the \$1,800 and disputing Respondent's entitlement to the fees being taken from the \$1,800. Respondent received the DeVinneys' e-mail.

5. On October 22, 2012, and on November 6, 2012, the DeVinneys sent Respondent an e-mail again requesting the \$1,800. Respondent received both e-mails from the DeVinneys, but did not pay them the \$1,800.

6. In early November, 2012, at the time Respondent knew the DeVinneys were disputing her entitlement to fees from the \$1,800, Respondent unilaterally paid herself \$599.90 from the \$1,800 in funds held in trust on behalf of the DeVinneys, thereby misappropriating the funds for her own use and benefit.

7. On November 7, 2012, Respondent sent a check from her client trust account to the DeVinneys in the amount of \$1,200.10 (\$1,800 less \$599.90).

8. It was not until May 30, 2013, and only after discipline charges were filed, that Respondent repaid \$599.90 to the DeVinneys.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

9. By misappropriating \$599.90 of the DeVinneys' funds for her own use and benefit, Respondent committed an act involving moral turpitude, dishonesty or corruption in willful violation of Business and Professions Code section 6106.

10. By withdrawing \$599.90 in payment of her fees after becoming aware the DeVinneys disputed her entitlement to the payment of fees, Respondent failed to maintain funds on behalf of the clients in Respondent's Client Trust Account in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(A)(2).

11. By failing to pay \$599.90 to the DeVinneys for more than six months, Respondent failed to pay promptly, as requested by a client, any funds in Respondent's possession which the client is entitled to receive in willful violation of Rules of Professional Conduct, rule 4-100(B)(4).

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES

Multiple Acts Standard 1.2(b)(ii): Respondent's three violations represent multiple acts of misconduct.

Harm Standard 1.2 (b)(iv): Respondent failed to pay client funds to the DeVinneys for over six months, thereby depriving them of the use of the money, which caused them significant harm.

ADDITIONAL FACTS RE MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

No Prior Discipline: Respondent has been in practice for 12 years and has no prior record of discipline. While Respondent's misconduct here is serious, Respondent's lack of a prior record of discipline is entitled to mitigation. (*In the Matter of Riordan* (Review Dept. 2007) 5 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 41.)

Pretrial Stipulation: Respondent is entitled to mitigation for entering into this stipulated settlement without the need of a trial to resolve the matter. (*In the Matter of Van Sickle* (Review Dept. 2006) 4 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 980.)

Good Character: Respondent has provided seven letters in support of her good character. (Feinstein v. State Bar (1952) 39 Cal.2d 541, 547 [letters of recommendation and favorable testimony of witnesses are entitled to considerable weight].) Respondent has performed pro bono activities as follows: Judge Pro Tem in Small Claims and Unlawful Detainer cases for the Contra Costa County Superior Court. (Calvert v. State Bar (1991) 54 Cal.3d 765,785 [pro bono work as mitigating factor].) She has also provided proof of her participation in the Contra Costa County Superior Court Settlement Mentor Program and Discovery Facilitator Program. (In the Matter of Respondent K (Review Dept. 1993) 2 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 518, 529 [civic service and charitable work entitled to weight in mitigation].) Respondent is entitled to weight in mitigation for good character.

AUTHORITIES SUPPORTING DISCIPLINE.

The Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct provide a "process of fixing discipline" pursuant to a set of written principles to "better discharge the purposes of attorney discipline as announced by the Supreme Court." (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, Introduction (all further references to standards are to this source).) The primary purposes of disciplinary proceedings and of the sanctions imposed are "the protection of the public, the courts and the legal profession; the maintenance of high professional standards by attorneys and the preservation of public confidence in the legal profession." *In re Morse* (1995) 11 Cal.4th 184, 205; std. 1.3.

Although not binding, the standards are entitled to "great weight" and should be followed "whenever possible" in determining level of discipline. In re Silverton (2005) 36 Cal.4th 81, 92, quoting In re Brown (1995) 12 Cal.4th 205, 220 and In re Young (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 267, fn. 11. Adherence to the standards in the great majority of cases serves the valuable purpose of eliminating disparity and assuring consistency, that is, the imposition of similar attorney discipline for instances of similar attorney misconduct. In re Naney (1990) 51 Cal.3d 186, 190. Any discipline recommendation different from that set forth in the applicable standards should clearly explain the reasons for the deviation. Blair v. State Bar (1989) 49 Cal.3d 762, 776, fn. 5.

Respondent admits to committing three acts of professional misconduct. Standard 1.6 (a) requires that where a Respondent acknowledges two or more acts of misconduct, and different sanctions are prescribed by the standards that apply to those acts, the sanction imposed shall be the more or most severe prescribed in the applicable standards.

The most severe sanction applicable to Respondent's misconduct is found in standard 2.2, which applies to Respondent's misappropriation of client funds. Standard 2.2(a) provides that culpability for willful misappropriation of entrusted funds shall result in disbarment. Only if the amount of funds is insignificantly small or if the most compelling mitigating circumstances predominate, shall disbarment not be imposed, but discipline shall not be less than one year actual suspension irrespective of mitigating circumstances.

In the instant case, the amount misappropriated, \$599.90, is insignificantly small. (Howard v. State Bar (1990) 51 Cal.3d 215 [misappropriation of \$1,300 was "involving a relatively small sum."]; In the Matter Bleecker (Review Dept. 1990) 1 Cal. State Bar Ct. Rptr. 113 [\$270 to be "a relatively small amount."]). Respondent's misconduct is aggravated by the fact that she unilaterally applied client funds held in trust toward payment of her fees after the clients disputed her payment, and then failed to return the \$599.90 for more than six months. Her misconduct deprived her clients of funds they were rightfully entitled to receive. Although Respondent's misconduct is serious, she has 12 years of practice without any prior record of discipline, has provided good character letters of reference and evidence of pro bono work in the legal community. Respondent has also entered into a pretrial stipulation, although the weight of this mitigation is tempered by the approaching trial date. Although the most compelling mitigating circumstances are not present in this case, an actual suspension of one year is warranted given that the amount of money misappropriated is insignificantly small.

A one-year actual suspension is supported by case law. In *Howard v. State Bar* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 215, an attorney with no prior discipline was actually suspended for six months for willfully misappropriating \$1,300 of a client's personal injury settlement funds. In imposing the discipline, the Supreme Court

noted that there was a substantial showing in mitigation based on the attorney's lifelong addiction to drugs and alcohol which directly caused the misconduct and the attorney's demonstrated rehabilitation from the addiction. Here, the amount of money misappropriated is less than in *Howard*, however, there is not a substantial showing of mitigation. Therefore, a longer actual suspension is appropriate.

On balance, one-year actual suspension is supported by the standards and case law and will serve the purposes of attorney discipline.

COSTS OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS.

Respondent acknowledges that the Office of the Chief Trial Counsel has informed respondent that as of August 30, 2013, the prosecution costs in this matter are \$5,418.00 (settlement before pretrial statement is filed). Respondent further acknowledges that should this stipulation be rejected or should relief from the stipulation be granted, the costs in this matter may increase due to the cost of further proceedings.

EXCLUSION FROM MCLE CREDIT

Pursuant to rule 3201, Respondent may <u>not</u> receive MCLE credit for completion of State Bar Ethics School, State Bar Client Trust Accounting School, and/or any other educational course(s) to be ordered as a condition of suspension. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, rule 3201.)

(Do not write above this line.)	
In the Matter of	Case number(s):
TERRI LEIGH BREWER	13-0-12074

SIGNATURE OF THE PARTIES

By their signatures below, the parties and their counsel, as applicable, signify their agreement with each of the recitations and each of the terms and conditions of this Stipulation Re Fact, Conclusions of Law and Disposition.

9/20/13	Aria Browe	Terri L. Brewer
Date	Respondent's Signativie	Print Name
9-20-13	Jeff Um	Geoffrey A. Mires
Date	Respondent's Counsel Signature	Print Name
9.20.13	Bern & Ast	Catherine E. Taylor
Dáte	Deputy Trial Counsel's Signature	Print Name

In the Matter of:	Case Number(s):	
TERRI LEIGH BREWER	13-O-14765	

ACTUAL SUSPENSION ORDER

Finding the stipulation to be fair to the parties and that it adequately protects the public, IT IS ORDERED that the requested dismissal of counts/charges, if any, is GRANTED without prejudice, and:



The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED and the DISCIPLINE RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.

The stipulated facts and disposition are APPROVED AS MODIFIED as set forth below, and the DISCIPLINE IS RECOMMENDED to the Supreme Court.

All Hearing dates are vacated.

The parties are bound by the stipulation as approved unless: 1) a motion to withdraw or modify the stipulation, filed within 15 days after service of this order, is granted; or 2) this court modifies or further modifies the approved stipulation. (See rule 5.58(E) & (F), Rules of Procedure.) The effective date of this disposition is the effective date of the Supreme Court order herein, normally 30 days after file date. (See rule 9.18(a), California Rules of Court.)

er 17,2013 Date

Judge of the State Bar Court

Page 14

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

[Rules Proc. of State Bar; Rule 5.27(B); Code Civ. Proc., § 1013a(4)]

I am a Case Administrator of the State Bar Court of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the within proceeding. Pursuant to standard court practice, in the City and County of San Francisco, on October 17, 2013, I deposited a true copy of the following document(s):

STIPULATION RE FACTS, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND DISPOSITION AND ORDER APPROVING

in a sealed envelope for collection and mailing on that date as follows:

- by first-class mail, with postage thereon fully prepaid, through the United States Postal Service at San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:
 - GEOFFREY ALLAN MIRES RANKIN SPROAT MIRES BEATY & REYNOLDS 1970 BROADWAY #1150 OAKLAND, CA 94612
- by interoffice mail through a facility regularly maintained by the State Bar of California addressed as follows:

CATHERINE E. TAYLOR, Enforcement, San Francisco

I hereby certify that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed in San Francisco, California, on October 17, 2013.

Bernadette C.O. Molina Case Administrator State Bar Court